

REMARKS

In a non-final office action mailed June 24, 2008, claims 1-6, 8-15, 17, and 18 were rejected. Applicants have amended claims 1, 8, 17, and 18. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration in view of the amendments above and the discussion that follows.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicants thank Examiner Pesin for the courtesies extended during an interview on September 19, 2008. During the interview the outstanding obviousness rejection of the independent claims was discussed. In particular, Applicants explained why the cited art failed to teach or suggest "multiple customer queues . . . organized to accommodate different customer priority levels" or "displaying . . . information relating to the availability of the listed agent during a future period of time." Regarding the latter limitation, the Examiner agreed that amending the claims to recite "specifying the availability" would overcome the outstanding rejection. No agreement was reached regarding the former limitation, but the Examiner did agree to further consider Applicants' position in their reply to the outstanding office action. Applicants again thank Examiner Pesin for taking the time to discuss this case.

CLAIM AMENDMENTS: CLAIMS 1, 8, 17, AND 18

Applicants' have amended claims 1 and 17 to recite "multiple customer queues are organized to accommodate different customer priority levels among the multiple customer queues," "an indication of a language skill," and "specifying the availability of the listed agent." Claims 8 and 18 have been amended in a similar fashion. Support for these amendments may be found, for example, in Applicants' specification at paragraphs 34 and 40 and FIGs. 4 and 8. As such, these amendments add no new matter.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103: CLAIMS 1-6, 8-15, 17, AND 18

Claims 1-3, 5, 8, 9, 14, 17, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,466,663 to Ravenscroft et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,046,789 to Anderson et al. Claims 4, 6, 10-13, 15, stand rejected over the above combination of Ravenscroft and Anderson further in view of other references that allegedly disclose the subject matter recited in the rejected dependent claims. Claims 1, 8, 17, and 18 are independent. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

As amended, Applicants' claims recite a graphical user interface comprising an overview area and a detailed area. The overview area displays group statistics that relate to a responsiveness of a selected group of interaction center agents being monitored. The overview area also indicates a number of customers present in each of multiple customer queues. The multiple customer queues are organized to accommodate different customer priority levels among the multiple customer queues. The detailed area displays a list of each agent of the selected group of interaction center agents being monitored. The detailed area further displays for each listed agent an indication of a language skill associated with the listed agent and information specifying the availability of the listed agent during a future period.

The claimed graphical user interface may allow a call center manager to better allocate agents and resources in a call center. For example, a call center manager can monitor customer contacts and enhance the quality of interaction center response. Specification, ¶ 24.

Applicants' amended claims are patentable over the cited references because the references, either separately or in combination, do not teach or suggest the claimed graphical user interface comprising an overview area and a detailed area, where the overview area displays "multiple customer queues . . . organized to accommodate different customer priority levels among the multiple customer queues." The cited art also fails to teach or suggest a detailed area that displays "an indication of a language skill associated with . . . [a] listed agent" or "information specifying the availability of . . . [a] listed agent during a future period of time."

As an initial matter, the cited references fail to disclose or render obvious multiple customer queues organized to accommodate different customer priority levels among the multiple customer queues. For example, Ravenscroft describes a window that includes a call center section and a statistics section. Ravenscroft, col. 6, lines 53-57 and FIG. 4. Ravenscroft notes that the statistics section displays information regarding calls by business type. *Id.* at col. 7, lines 20-26. The displayed information includes a business client name, calls processed for a business, and the current number of calls being processed for a business. *Id.* Ravenscroft also describes a pop-window that appears upon clicking a business type within the statistics section of the window. *Id.* at col. 7, lines 45-57. Ravenscroft mentions that the pop-window includes summary statistics regarding calls processed for a business type. *Id.* For example, Ravenscroft states that the summary statistics can include calls in the queue waiting for an agent and available agents. *Id.*

Ravenscroft does not disclose multiple customer queues organized to accommodate different customer priority levels among the multiple customer queues. The office action seems to allege that Ravenscroft's description of displaying summary statistics in a pop-window teaches multiple customer queues organized to accommodate different customer priority levels. In particular, the office action asserts that "it is inherent that a queue will have different priority for different users with the customers at the top of the queue having higher priority." Office action mailed June 24, 2008, pg. 3. Apparently the action is arguing that customers *within a single queue* will inherently have different priorities. However, as amended, the claims recite multiple customer queues are organized to accommodate different customer priority levels *among the multiple customer queues*. Nowhere does Ravenscroft mention or suggest such an organization.

Anderson fails to remedy the deficiencies of Ravenscroft. Anderson discusses a call center management system that includes a statistics display system that presents call center statistics in different user-defined views. Anderson, Abstract. For example, Andersen describes an agent statistics window that displays agent statistics in various formats and levels of detail. *Id.* at col. 11, lines 39-47. The agent statistics screen allows a user to view an agent's

performance based on, among other things, time, volume of calls, and agent efficiency. *Id.* at col. 15, lines 1-7. Thus, Anderson describes displaying agent statistics. Nowhere does Anderson teach or suggest displaying multiple customer queues, much less displaying multiple customer queue organized as recited in Applicants' claims.

Moreover, the cited references also fail to teach or suggest a detailed area displaying an indication of a language skill associated with the listed agents and information specifying the availability of the listed agents during a future period of time. The office action concedes that Ravenscroft fails to teach an indication of a skill associated with a listed agent and information relating to the availability of the listed agent during a future period of time. Office action mailed June 24, 2008, pg. 4. Therefore, *a fortiori*, Ravenscroft also fails to teach these limitations as amended.

Here too, Anderson fails to supply what Ravenscroft lacks. The office action asserts that Anderson's discussion of displaying statistics relating to agent efficiency teaches displaying an indication of a skill associated with listed agents. Even assuming, for the sake of argument, that this assertion is correct, Anderson describes displaying statistics regarding agents' effectiveness at fielding calls. See, e.g., Anderson, col. 15, line 55-col. 16, line 31. Nowhere does Anderson teach or suggest displaying a language skill associated with an agent as recited in Applicants' claims.

Similarly, Anderson does not teach or suggest information specifying the availability of the listed agents during a future period of time. The office action asserts that Anderson's description of displaying a near real-time status of agent teaches this limitation. In particular, the action asserts that "a user will know that the agent is available now and that he will *likely* be available for sometime in the future." Office action mailed June 24, 2008, pg. 10. (emphasis added). However, as discussed during the interview, an agent's past or current status does not specify an agent's future status. As such, Anderson does not teach or suggest specifying the availability of the listed agents during a future period of time.

As such, the cited references, taken either alone or in combination, do not anticipate or give rise to a *prima facie* case of obviousness for any of Applicants' independent claims 1, 8, 17,

or 18. Furthermore, the cited references do not anticipate or give rise to a prima facie case of obviousness for any of Applicants' claims 2-6 and 9-15 each of which depends, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1 or 8.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that claims 1-6, 8-15, 17, and 18 are in condition for allowance, and requests that the Examiner issue a Notice of Allowance.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10-20-08


Linzy T McCartney
Reg. No. 61,886

Fish & Richardson P.C.
60 South Sixth Street
Suite 3300
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 335-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945